

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

February 7, 2000 LB 74

Chambers, on the committee amendments.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I support the committee amendment. And since we've had kind of a wide-ranging discussion, I'm going to try to say in a nutshell what this bill does. First of all, it doesn't matter whether we pass it or not. If we don't pass it, we simply have an erroneous definition in the statute of what an infraction is. I brought the bill last year, I brought it before Senator Engel introduced his bill about red light cameras. This was to correct that definition. I have fought traffic cases to the Supreme Court and won them. I have cited the Knoles case repeatedly, and I would begin by saying, according to Knoles, a traffic infraction is a criminal offense, therefore the prosecution must prove every element of the offense beyond a reasonable doubt. That's standard practice. This amendment does nothing other than correct an erroneous definition in the statute. I don't know of any other way to make it clear. I think the problem is that there are questions about my motives when I do things like this, so that's why I tell you, I don't care if you don't pass it; all it means is that you've got an erroneous definition. Who else knew that the definition was wrong? Who else knew the definition violated what the Supreme Court said? I know because it's an area of the law that I deal in on a regular basis. Now, if you had something dealing with title insurance, Senator Beutler could probably, if he ran across something in a case that none of us might read, could see where we got something in statute that does not comport with what the Nebraska Supreme Court has said. Maybe Senator Raikes is an expert on the Uniform Commercial Code. Well, not calling myself an expert, but my record of winning these decisions...these cases in the Nebraska Supreme Court is better than that of any practicing lawyer that I know of or have heard of, because most lawyers think these cases cannot be won. So the amendment will do only this; it will define an infraction in the same way that the Nebraska Supreme Court has defined it. That's all that it does, nothing more, nothing less. In talking to Senator Beutler, I understand more clearly what he was talking about. In order to tie the prosecution of infractions to existing procedure, there being nothing in the statutes now, he was of a mind to suggest that the statutes say, not this one, we're just amending the definition, that infractions will be